



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

paid to a *de facto* clerk who performed the duties of the position during the interval.

The case of *Higgins v. The Mayor*, 131 N. Y. 128, is directly in point, and following *Terhune v. The Mayor*, 80 N. Y. 185, holds that payment to another who actually did the work is a good defense to such an action by a municipal corporation. The general rule is to the contrary. *Dillon, Mun. Corps.*, sec. 235. The salary of a public office is incident to the title and wrongful payment to a *de facto* officer is no defense to an action by a *de jure* officer. *Dorsey v. Smith*, 28 Cal. 21. A municipal corporation wrongfully removing an officer is liable for his salary. *Shaw v. Macon*, 19 Ga. 468. The amount of salary received by a *de facto* officer is the measure of damages receivable by a *de jure* officer for deprivation from office. *United States v. Addison*, 6 Wall. 291.

TITLE TO ANIMAL SKINS—BURDEN OF PROOF—PRESUMPTION.—*LINDEN V. McCORMICK ET AL.*, 96 N. W. 785 (MINN.).—*Held*, that where the plaintiff purchased deer skins for commercial purposes, it is to be presumed the game was lawfully killed and the skins came lawfully into his possession.

No previous adjudication of the point involved has been found. It is probably the first time it has come before the court for determination. Sec. 33, chap. 22, Gen. Laws, Minn., declares that no person can acquire title to game except by proving the killing of it at the time, and in the manner authorized. This statute was declared constitutional in *State v. Rodman*, 58 Minn. 393. In the present case the court distinguished between the title to game and the title to the product thereof, *id est*, the skins. The burden of proving that the skins were not legally obtained is on the State. *James v. Wood*, 82 Me. 173. *Thomas v. Northern Pacific Express Co.*, 73 Minn. 185.

The modern tendency as set forth in this case is, that "a person in good faith may acquire a valid title to skins of wild animals although the same may have been killed contrary to law."

USE OF STREETS—ADDITIONAL SERVITUDE—TELEPHONES.—*KIRBY V. CITIZENS' TEL. CO.*, 97 N. W. 3 (S. D.).—*Held*, that the construction and maintenance of a telephone system on the streets of a city in such a manner as not to cause unnecessary injury is not an additional servitude for which an abutting property owner is entitled to compensation.

The decision in the principal case is based upon the principle that telephones are a means of communication. The reasonable use of the streets of a city for the necessary equipment of a telephone system is not a new and additional burden for which the abutting property owner is entitled to compensation. *Anerach v. Tel. Co.*, 70 Ohio N. P. 633. Other courts hold that telephones were not in contemplation when highways were constructed. *Pacific Cable Co. v. Irvine*, 49 Fed. 113. The construction of a telephone line is an additional burden for which the abutting owner is entitled to compensation. *Eels v. Am. Tel. Co.*, 143 N. Y. 133; *Board of Trade v. Barnett*, 107 Ill. 507; *Willis v. Erie Telegraph & Tel. Co.*, 37 Minn. 347; *Stowerson v. Tel. Co.*, 68 Miss. 559.

WATERCOURSES—SUBTERRANEAN CHANNELS—PERCOLATING WATERS—ADJOINING OWNERS—WASTE—INJUNCTION.—*BARCLAY V. ABRAHAM ET AL.*, 96 N.